REMARKS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Advisory Action of July 2, 2004, the Examiner maintains the rejection with the assertion that Applicants' arguments are not directed to features recited in the claims. The Examiner further maintains that the structural features of the invention are the same as those disclosed in the Sato reference.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner appears to be incorrect in his position. The present claims recite in the body of the claims that the charge transfer material "forms a charge transfer complex with an organic or inorganic semiconductor." The device of the invention must necessarily have a semiconductor component. Thus, the semiconductor is an explicitly recited feature of the invention. There is no disclosure in Sato of a semiconductor component. As such, Applicants are not presenting arguments based on features not recited in the claims and Sato fails to disclose or suggest the present invention.

As the above-indicated remarks address and overcome the objections and rejections of the Examiner, withdrawal of the objections and rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions, regarding the present application, he is requested to please contact, MaryAnne Armstrong, PhD (Reg. No. 40,069) in the Washington DC area at (703) 205-8000.

Docket No. 3672-0111P App. No. 09/763,948

Applicants respectfully request a two (2) month extension of time for filing the present response. The required fee is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH et BIRCH, LLP

MaryAnne Armstrong, PhD., #40,069

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MKM/MAA 3672-0111P

1